

NAME - MOHAMMAD RASHID RAZA

ENROLLMENT No - 194505382

PROGRAMME - MAPY

COURSE CODE - MPYE-008

COURSE NAME - Metaphysics

Question 1 Metaphysics is a core concept and ground of all knowledge and philosophy. It is core ground of human knowledge as it underlies, penetrates, transforms, and unifies all other department of knowledge. The scope of metaphysics includes both its material and formal objects. Generally matter indicates the indeterminate but determinable element and form the determining element. Material object is definite realm or definite subject matter which a science deal with. For instance, man, stars, inanimate matter, earth, language, religion, law etc. ~~For~~ on other hand formal object is that special aspect of the material object which is under consideration or study.

Let's understand ~~some~~ few significant views on the starting point of metaphysics among the metaphysicians.

① Belief is the starting point of Metaphysics.

Everything has a starting point that comes first before everything else and from where or which it begins. The physical science have their starting point in the concrete data of the sense obtained through observation or experimentation. The anthropological and cultural sciences have a broader starting point. It is constituted not only by sense experience but also by man's intellectual reflection upon himself. The starting point of philosophical sciences is intellectual reflection on the general data of experience with respect to the being for man and things outside man. The theological sciences have the data of revelation as their starting point.

The starting point of metaphysics is experience of something as it manifests itself in various forms. Experience means special form

form of knowledge derived from the immediate reception of the ~~the~~ or of the 'impression' in contrast to discursive thought, mere conventionally accepted opinions, or historical tradition.

Before experience belief is important, and desire to know about any thing. Belief is ~~may~~ something that helps you to agree with the outcomes, even sometimes it's not as per your ~~exp~~ previous experience or knowledge.

(b) Judgement is the starting point of Metaphysics.

Every act of knowledge reveals a characteristic duality when it is expressed in a judgement that is reference and assertion.

Knowledge always refers to something or someone and makes an assertion about this something or someone in either an affirmative or a negative way. To know something or someone always means to know it or one as being this way or that way, or not this way or that, i.e. as judgement is an act of ~~that~~ the intellect in which we say something of an object by way of affirmation or denial.

Every ~~part~~ particular judgement ^{may} be considered as the reply of the question. Is the being in question ^{may} as it asserted to be in the proposition? This question is raised in the series of previously accepted suppositions.

Judgements are the two kinds; direct and indirect. Direct judgement is an act of the intellect in which we say something of an object, empirically or transcendently. Empirical direct judgement is an act of the intellect in which we say something of an object as presented to our sense. e.g. this is a pen. Transcendental direct judgement is an act of intellect in which we say something of something which directly and immediately but implicitly in all human experiences. e.g. this is something.

Indirect or mediate judgement is an act of the intellect in which we say something of an object derivatively, for example "all men are mortal". Every judgement also has two aspects concrete synthesis and affirmative synthesis. Concrete synthesis is a synthesis which joins a predicate of itself universal with an individual subject and thus restricts the concept of this individual alone. e.g. this is a pen.

Objective synthesis is the position of correspondence between ourselves, as possessing the complex totality of sensible and intelligible signs and the things which is represented and signified by them, e.g. this is a pen. Objection: Every judgement presupposes at least an implicit awareness of the one who judges. Notion of self is a priori to judgement itself. Hence judgement cannot be that which comes first before everything else, and from which we begin.

① Idea of actuality

The term act comes from the Latin root *Actus*, that means an entity of whatever kind which perfects and determines a thing in its being or perfection itself. It includes the power of faculty operations of the faculty, accidents, essence, substance, form and act of existing. Whatever a being has or is in a positive manner is an act. It is perfection itself. There are as many kinds of acts as there are kinds of being for every being as such is a perfection.

Pure act is subsisting perfection without any limit. It lacks no entity nor can it receive an increase of entity as it possesses all possible actuality. There are pure acts both in the order of existence and essence.

The order of existence implies the act of existing of all beings and the exercise or occurrence or happening of all operations. The order of essence implies all the determinations of beings, which make them be such or such. The pure act in the order of existence is God the pure acts in the order of essence and angels, whose substantial forms are not restricted. Mixed act is a composition of perfection and potentiality. e.g. all corporal beings. Mixed act in the order of existence proper. It includes every finite being insofar it is composed of the act of existing and complete essence.

② Idea of potency

Potency is a Latin word that means power. Potency is the capacity of act. It is the capacity of aptitude in reference to something which a being is not or has not but which it can be or can receive. There are two kind of potency; Active potency and Passive potency.

Active potency is the capacity of communicate act or perfection to another. It is a power of action, such as the power of hearing.

Since such a power in itself already confers certain perfection upon its subject, it is an act with respect to its subject.

Hence it may also be called first act. Passive potency is the capacity to receive act or perfection from another. e.g. a child has the capacity for acquiring knowledge from parents and teachers. There are two kinds of passive potency. Determinate passive and Indeterminate passive. Determinate passive potency is that which contains an act and is an potency to some further act. e.g. substance for accident the complete essence for the act of existing. ~~but~~ Indeterminate passive potency is the principle of an act but which itself contains no act. It is pure potency. e.g. prime matter.

Question 3

A Evaluate the problem of evil.
Problem of evil has always baffled the thinkers of every age, and continues to be one of the most puzzling ones. Once David Hume raised the old Epicurean question "why is there any misery at all in the world? is it from the intention of the Deity. God is absolute good. Hence it is impossible for him to be ~~the~~ the author of evil. He cannot will evil, and no shadow of evil falls on him. How can anything be or happen which is opposed to God and his goodness? or how can a just omnipotent and an infinitely good God create evil or permit evil?

There are two main kinds of evil physical and moral. physical evil is the privation of a perfection pertaining to the physical order. It is the privation of the physical good. physical evil is an established fact in the world. Moral evil is privation of a perfection pertaining to moral order. It is also evident that moral evil is present among humans, sin is an undeniable fact. Crime is an everyday occurrence. However it would be false to consider moral evil as a positively existing entity. In fact the sinful action as an action is ontologically good insofar as it is something. Moral evil doesn't consist in a positive entity or reality but in a privation that is relative.

There are two types of nature of evil -

① Evil is ~~a~~ relation - Evil is the privation of perfection, which is due to a subject. Privation means the present absence of the quality of the things. Now if evil is the privation of perfection or good, then it means that in due course it will be replaced by the good. Hence evil is not absolute but relative.

② Evil is Mystery - A mystery is that in which we participate and with which we are vitally involved. we cannot separate ourselves from a mystery as we can a problem, and no amount of increased knowledge or skill will dispel.

3 D what is free will? Critically evaluate the notion of free will.

Free will is the ability of the will, all conditions for action being present, to decide whether to act or not act and whether to act in this manner or in that manner. The will is free from intrinsic necessity or determination in at least some of its acts. i.e. will is capable of choice when all the conditions for acting are present. It doesn't mean that will is free in every respect. For instance, it is governed by intrinsic necessity or determination in seeking happiness. Beside, the will acts impulsively and indeliberately in many circumstances. The advocates of free will admit that certain states and mental conditions makes it impossible for the will to exercise its freedom, such as sleep, absent mindedness, delirium, hypnosis, insanity etc.

There are four arguments justifying freedom:

① Argument from common consent - Majority of humans believe

that their will is free. This ~~common~~ conviction is of the utmost practical importance for the whole human life. Therefore if there is order in the world, the majority of humankind cannot be wrong in this belief. Hence the will is free.

② Psychological Argument - We have said that most people naturally hold that the will is free. Why do they cling to that conviction? This is because they are directly and indirectly aware of the freedom of their own decisions. They are directly aware of their freedom in the very act of making a free decision.

③ Ethical Argument - If there is no freedom, there is no real responsibility, no virtue, no merit, no moral obligation, no duty and no morality. The necessary connection between freedom and these spiritual realities is quite obvious and is demonstrated in ethics.

④ Philosophical Argument - Every kind of knowledge evokes a corresponding kind of striving as my knowledge is always knowledge of something. In knowledge my mind freely tends or strives towards the object of my knowledge. This follows from the fact that knowledge and striving are the two fundamental immaterial functions or aspects of a rational being.

Philosophically freedom is also an analogous concept predicated in different ways of different types. The various forms of attributes indicate a formal relation which remains the same. This relation can be put negative or positive. When we look at freedom in this way, human freedom is neither merely negative and relative nor fully positive and absolute.

Question 4

A Discuss the role of *vishesh* in *Vaisheshika's* Metaphysics.

Vishesh according to *Vaisheshika* is a unique type of real, which cannot be brought under any other category. It is not substance as it is not the substratum of quality. It is not quality or action, for it does not participate in a universal. It is not a relation so it cannot be identified by inherence. Each particularity inheres only in one eternal substance and is, therefore, not a universal which is supposed to be related to many individuals. In the same way mutual non-existence, which exists in two entities and are dissimilar, cannot serve the purpose of *vishesh*. Therefore mutual non-existence of a cloth and a jar in each other. But particularities exist in two eternal substances, which have similar qualities, and distinguish themselves from each other. So mutual non-existence cannot serve the purpose of particularities. Therefore the existence of particular must be inferred to account for the ultimate distinction of eternal substance.

B

Being is neither Univocal nor Equivocal but Analogous. Univocal is not the concept of Being. The concept of univocal abstracts from the differences of its inferiors, whereas Being actually includes these differences. For instance a substance is a being in the sense of something whose being is being in itself. An accident is a being in the sense of something whose being is a being ~~of~~ in another. Again God's being is different from that of any creature being because unlike any creature He is His own being. Hence it is clear that the diversity of relationship to Being prevents the univocal predication of Being.

Secondly Being is not equivocal, if equivocity occurs when there is no foundation in reality why should diverse things be called by the same name? But we can predicate the name Being of diverse things because each of them is something which has a reference to Being. Hence there is a foundation in reality for the predication of the ~~same~~ term, so that being is not equivocal. As a result, it follows by exclusion that the notion of Being is analogous. Being is thus analogous according to the intrinsic analogy of participation and proportionality. A term is analogous by analogy of attribution if the perfection signified by it is found intrinsically in the primary analogue and is attributed to others only because of a consideration of their causal relationship to primary analogue. Now the perfection of Being is realized intrinsically in each of the analogues. Hence, it is clear that formally speaking Being cannot be analogous by extrinsic analogy of attribution.

4C

write a note on Brahmaparinamavada.

Sattkaryavada or parinamavada means that the effect is only an explicit manifestation of what was implicit and latent in the cause. Ramanuja believes in the parinamavada form of Sattkaryavada which means that the material cause really changes itself in the form of its effect. His view is known as Brahmaparinamavada because according to it, the entire universe including the material world and the individual soul is a real modification of Brahman. The Samkhya view is found in the famous words of the Gita "There can be no existence of the non-existence and non-existence of the existent". According to this view an effect is not a new entity, an effect is already contained in its cause ~~in effect exists in its~~ unmanifested state and the production of an effect merely means its manifestation. Since an effect exists in its cause in an unmanifested state even before its appearance, it is considered to be ever-existent effect. As the manifestation of an effect is brought about by a change in the cause which is conceived as a real change, it is called parinamavada that is theory of transformation or evolution from the cause.

4E

Write a note on primary and Secondary Analogue.

Term analogue is one which is said of many in a way which is somewhat same and somewhat different. It is one and the same name predicated of many according to concept which are not entirely different but agree in some common point. In analogous predication the external term remains the same but the concept of which the term is a symbol neither remains

exactly the same as is the case of univocal predication, nor becomes entirely different as it happens in equivocal predication. There are two terms of analogue.

- ① Primary analogue is the object which first deserves the term or of which it is first predicated. Here term belongs principally.
- ② Secondary analogue is the object which possesses in a lesser degree the perfection indicated by the term or to which the term is later applied. And in secondary analogue the term is predicated in dependence upon the primary analogue. For example; if one predicates healthy of human, fresh air, and medicine, human is the primary analogue and fresh air and medicine are the secondary analogues.

Question 5

A

Symbebekas — The original Aristotelian term *symbebekas* for predicaments accident meant going along with or occurring with something else. Size, color for example go with or presuppose the bodies of which they are merely the modifications. They can change while the body's nature remains the same. An individual human passes through the different stages of embryo, foetus, childhood, youth, maturity and old age changing in many ways in size, shape, color, activities, place and time but remaining identical in substance. These accidental characteristics are really distinct from the substance, regardless of any consideration by human mind. They distinct realities that occur to or belong to a substance. The etymology of the Latin term *accidens*, falling upon or happening expresses it quite vividly.

5 B

Samavaya — Samavaya means Inherence, it plays a very important part in upholding pluralistic realism. That principle which relates two inseparable entities is recognised as inherent relation. It is necessary to relate substance with its quality, action, generality and particularity. Kanada defines inherence as that combination which produces in respect of cause and effect, the notion of this being contained in that or here. The conception of Samavaya first originated in connection with the relation of cause and effect. Inherence always subsists in inseparable things such as the whole and the parts, quality and substance, action and substance, generality and the individual and particularity and an eternal substance. Inherence is one eternal relation, it is one, because it has the same distinguishing feature. One inherence can account for all notions and so it is useless to assume many inferences. Inherence is also eternal for all positive produces and produced in their material cause by the relation of inherence and if inherence is produced, it will require another inherence and so on ad infinitum. So in order to avoid infinite regress, inherence is regarded as eternal.

5 C

Causality — The principle of causality states; whatever happens or becomes must have a cause for its happening or becoming. Action always implies a change and change implies causality. The agent is the cause and the action of the agent producing the change is the causality. The change produced in patient as ~~separate~~ reaction is the effect. Cause is that which produced an effect. In the traditional view cause is an ontological principle which exercises a positive influence in the production of something else. Positive influence in the production of effect or the causality. The positive productive ontological influence on the being of a thing is the most important factor of causality. Cause cannot be purely logical principle for a purely logical influence of one thing on another is insufficient to constitute causality.

5D

Asalkaryavada - It holds the view that effect is a new creation without any prior existence in the cause. In Nyaya Vaisesika theory; the differentiation is essence between the substrate and their properties. There is an absolute difference between a cause and its effect. A cloth in order to be real must have an ~~effect which~~ ~~was non-existent before~~ essence difference from that of the threads. From the existent comes into being an effect which was non-existent before. Cause defined by Udayana is an invariable antecedent of an effect which is unconditional or necessary. If an unconditional antecedent, which is always present when an effect is present and absent when an effect is absent were not regarded as its cause then the effect would be uncased. Hence, the first essential characteristic of a cause is its antecedence to the effect. The second is its invariability; it must invariably precede the effect. The third is its unconditionality; it must ~~invariably~~ ~~unconditionally~~ or necessarily precede the effect. There is no destruction of the cause prior to the emergence of the effect. The cause continues to exist even after its effect is produced. An effect is never produced out of its cause. The cause is a substance which does not transmit its essence to the effect. Though the effect has nothing in common with the cause yet the former can reside only in the latter. The effect arises in the cause and resides only in the latter.

5H

Vivartavada - According to vivartavada, the essence of an effect is identical with the essence of its cause. The difference between cause and effect consists in difference between the two forms of the identical stuff. In a ~~causal~~ causal process, the form of a cause is changed into a new form without involving any change in the essence of the causal stuff. Now unless there is change in the essence of the causal stuff, there cannot be any real change even in the form of the stuff itself. The Advaitins therefore hold that what is considered as real modification of causal stuff is only an appearance. The manifold world of different forms and names is not the result or the real modification of Brahman the abiding eternal substance, but only an appearance generated by beginningless avidya. Thus the parinamavada of Samkhya logically leads to the vivartavada of Sankara, according to which there is no real production of the effect.